



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes, Critical and Lexicographical.

PROF. DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

HARTFORD, CONN.

I. I Sam. ii. 24. The Massoretic text reads: **כִּי לֹא טוֹבָה הַשְׁמָעָה אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שֹׁמֵעַ מֵעֲבָרִים עִם יְהוָה**: A. V. and R. V. accept this text and translate, "Ye make the LORD's people to transgress." This is simply impossible. Wellhausen accepts the text and Ewald's explanation, *in Umlauf setzen, verbreiten*. Budde accepts the text and, presumably, this rendering. Driver also accepts the rendering, but has a *caveat* that "the integrity of the text is reasonably open to suspicion." The LXX. render τοῦ μὴ δουλεύειν λαὸν θεῶ; they had apparently the same text and could make nothing of it.

Driver notes that **הַעֲבִיר** in this sense is always accompanied by an "indication of the locality *in* or *through* which the proclamation is 'made to pass.'" I would add to that another consideration which makes the text impossible for me. If we adopt this rendering, **עִם יְהוָה**, to use the language of Arab grammarians, is *maf'āl bzhi* to **שֹׁמֵעַ**, and **מֵעֲבָרִים** is a *hāl*, *i. e.* "I hear the people of Yahweh in the state of persons spreading." But the *hāl* must come last, and therefore the order would be **עִם יְהוָה מֵעֲבָרִים**. The point is that **עִם יְהוָה מֵעֲבָרִים** is not a clause consisting of subject and predicate in which the predicate could be made to precede. Even though that were the case, the construction would still be difficult, as the predicate is only made to precede for a definite reason, and there is none here. Further, the juxtaposition of the two participles is exceedingly harsh and awkward. I would suggest, then, to read, **אֲנִי שֹׁמֵעַ בְּנִי מֵעַם יְהוָה**. The **מֵעַם** in **מֵעֲבָרִים** is got from the preceding **מֵעַם** in **שֹׁמֵעַ** and **ר** in some forms of the archaic alphabet is hardly distinguishable from **ז**.

II. I Sam. iv. 15, **וְעֵינָיו קָמָה**; I Kings xiv. 4, **קָמָו עֵינָיו**. This phrase seems to indicate some form of blindness, but its occurrence in Arabic has not, apparently, been noticed. Lane (*Suppl.*, p. 2996, c) quotes from Abū Zayd in the *Lisān* (s. **سَدَّ**) **عَيْنٌ فَائِمَةٌ** *An eye [blind, or white and blind, but still whole: or] that has become white and blind but not burst: and from the Mughrīb of al-Muṭarrizī and the Miṣbāḥ of al-Fayyūmī:—sightless, but with the black still remaining.*

III. Num. xi. 4. **הָאֲסַפְקָה** is generally explained as = **הָאֲסַפְקָה** from **אָסַף** with the **א** dropped out of pronunciation as in **הָאֲזִקִּים** and **בְּאִזְקִים**. This is not quite satisfactory, as the **א** which drops out in **אֲזִקִּים** does not belong to the root, but is formal; nor is the sense derived by connection with **אָסַף** very good. Lane (p. 1368, c) suggests the Arabic **سَفَسَفَ**, "anything that is bad, paltry, mean," used of poetry, disposition, affair, action, saying, etc. To the examples quoted by Lane, I would add *Fihrist*, p. 91, l. 28, where it is opposed to **جَيِّد** and used of poetry.

IV. Prov. xii. 3 b. **וְשֹׁרֵשׁ צְדִיקִים בֶּל יִמוּט** is commonly rendered "but the root of the righteous shall never be moved." This takes **שֹׁרֵשׁ** in its first sense of root, and the figure is somewhat confused. It is intelligible to speak of the "root of the righteous," but how a root can **מוּט**, 'sway, stagger, slip,' is not clear. In Job xiii. 27 we read **וְשֹׁרְשֵׁי רַגְלִי תַחֲקֶה** and **שֹׁרְשֵׁי רַגְלִי** is taken generally as meaning "my feet" or "the soles of my feet." Did **שֹׁרֵשׁ**, **שֹׁרְשֵׁים** come to have itself the meaning *foot, feet*, and are we to translate the passage in Proverbs, "but the foot of the righteous shall not slip?" Compare *ψψ* xxxviii. 17; xciv. 18, etc.

V. **מוֹפֶת**. In the new English *Gesenius*, now appearing in parts, **מוֹפֶת** is referred to a root **אָפַת** and with that root is given the following etymology:

"Meaning dub. ✓ whence Arabic **أُفِتَّ** [a misprint for **أُفِتَّ**] calamity, and also *wonder, portent*; according to Thes. Arabic ✓ = **أُفِيَ** *suffer evil*."

Here there are several points to which exception can be taken. First, Gesenius (*Thes.*, p. 143) does not refer **أُفِتَّ** to a root **أُفِيَ** but to a root **أُفِيَ** (a mistake which he probably got from the Calcutta *Qāmūs*), and secondly, it is wrong to speak of a root **أُفِيَ**, since **أُفِيَ** is simply the perfect passive (like **قِيلَ**) of a root **أَوْف**. See the root in Lane; and notice that it does not mean to *suffer evil* generally, but is used mostly of crops, and means to *be smitten with a blight, blast, taint, canker*, or the like.

Last, it is true that on p. 143 of the *Thesaurus* Gesenius gives מופת to the root אפת, but on p. 612 he takes it all back, and refers the word to the root יפה (Barth appears to do the same, *Nominalbildung*, § 172, c) through a form מופאת, and to this withdrawal he again directs attention on p. 72 of the *Corrigenda*.

But it may be worth while to inquire further whether there is any such word in Arabic as أَفْتٌ and what we know generally about the root أَفْت. It is unlucky that this root did not fall within Lane's definition of "classical words and significations commonly known to the learned among the Arabs," and was therefore excluded from his First Book and, in the end, from his Lexicon. We are thus forced back on the Arabic lexicographers, and I shall give in translation all that I have collected from such of them as are accessible to me. I may say that the only Arab lexicon which has been printed and is not accessible to me is the *Nihāya fī Gharīb al-Hadīth* by Ibn al-Athīr [d. A. H. 606], which appeared at Cairo a year or two ago. The root أَفْت is lacking completely in the *Ṣaḥāḥ* of al-Jawharī [d. A. H. 393], the *Asās* of az-Zamakhsharī [d. A. H. 538], and the *Miṣbāḥ* of al-Fayyūmī, who finished his work in A. H. 734. Nor can I find any trace of أَفْت in the *Fiqh al-Lughā* of ath-Tha'ālibī [d. A. H. 429], or the *Kitāb al-Faṣīḥ* of Tha'lab [d. A. H. 291], or the *Mu'arrab* of al-Jawālīqī [d. A. H. 465], or the *Kitāb al-Aqdād* of Ibn al-Anbārī [d. A. H. 328], or Dozy's *Supplément* with Fleischer's *Studien* and von Kremer's *Beiträge*, the only European contributions of which account can be taken in such a matter as this.

In the *Lisān al-'Arab* of al-Mukarram [d. A. H. 711] the root أَفْت occurs and runs as follows:

أَفْتٌ from such and such, like أَفَكَهُ, *i. e.* he turned him; and الْأَفْتُ is the highly bred of camels and its feminine is the same. Abū 'Amr said الْأَفْتُ is the highly bred; and Tha'lab said الْأَفْتُ, with فَاتٌ, is the swift she-camel, and it is she who overcomes camels in journeying, and he recited from Ibn Aḥmar;—

* كَانِي لَمْ أَقْدَلْ عَاجَ لَأَفْتٍ * تُرَاوِحُ بَعْدَ هِرَّتِهَا الرَّسِيمَا

As though I had not said, 'Ājin [a chiding cry] to a swift she-camel who alternated after her Hizza [a sharp pace] the Rasīm [another sharp pace].

And in a MS. is ^{اَفْت} with *Kasr*—so the *Tahdhīb*.

And there is the saying of al-'Ajjāj :—

✽ إِذَا بَنَاتُ الْأَرْحَبِيِّ ^{اَفْت} ✽ [فَارَبْنَ أَفْصَى غَوْلِهِ بِأَلْمَتِ]

Whenever the daughters of the Arḥabite, the swift she-camel, [draw near to the extremity of its extent through advance in journeying.]

Ibn al-A'rābī said :—He means by ^{اَفْت} the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her, as Ibn Aḥmar said. And Abū 'Amr said,

^{اَفْت} is the highly bred ; he said that it stood so in a MS.

that was recited [or read] to Shamir—✽ إِذَا بَنَاتُ الْأَرْحَبِيِّ

✽ ^{اَفْت}. Ibn al-A'rābī said :—I do not know whether

this is dialectal or a mistake.

It will be noticed here that the root ^{اَفْت} is simply a by-form to ^{اَفَك} and that besides that by-form there only exists, according to this lexicon, a noun ^{اَفْت} or ^{اَفْت}, meaning a swift, highly bred camel or she-camel. It should be noticed, too, how elaborate is the care with which these meanings are established by means of old authorities, Ibn al-A'rābī, Tha'lab, Abū 'Amr, Ibn Aḥmar. This is the method of Arabic lexicography. A word or a meaning is regarded as of no value if it is not based on a quotation from the works of some one who was born at least not after the establishment of al-Islām in Arabia, or on the authority of some early lexicographer of repute.

Next in chronological order comes the *Qāmūs* of al-Fīrūzābādī [d. A. H. 816], and there we shall find something, if not exactly what we are looking for.

^{اَفْت} with *Fath* is the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her, and the swift camel which overcomes the camels in journeying and the highly bred of camels ; and sometimes it has

Kasr. And ^{اَفْت} and ^{اَفْت}. And an encampment of the tribe of Hudhayl. And with *Kasr* it is [the same as]

^{اَفْت}, and ^{اَفْت} is, 'he turned him.'

It will be noticed that the greater part of what stands here is exactly as in the *Lisān*, with the omission of all authorities. This is the method of al-Firūzābādī throughout, and his dictionary is simply an enormous vocabulary, and, in consequence, is not regarded as of any authority in itself. What he adds to the *Lisān* is the point of interest for us. It is that **الْأَفْتُ**, or, apparently, **الْأَفْتُ = دَاهِيَةٌ** and **العجب**.

As to **دَاهِيَةٌ**, its common meaning is certainly *calamity*; and **أَفِيكَةٌ**

[See, too, the *Fiqh*, p. 322, l. 7 of Bayrūt ed.] and **أَفَكَةٌ** or **آفَكَةٌ** are given in Lane as having that meaning; but there is another possibility.

According to Lane, (p. 927, *b*) you can say **دُهِيتُ**, *I was turned, or kept from a thing, or an affair, by deceit or guile*. This *to be turned from* is exactly the force which we have already found assigned to **أَفْتُ** as a by-form of **أَفَكٌ**. **دَاهٍ**, then, would mean *one who so turns another*, and

دَاهِيَةٌ *the stratagem, deceit that turns anyone*; and this last may be the meaning that al-Firūzābādī, or his authority, intended to assign to

الْأَفْتُ. The case of **العجب** is more difficult, but it is certain, at least, that it does not mean *portent*, nor, in the first instance, *a wonder*.

العجب is more immediately *the act or state of wondering*; and if a *wonder* had been meant we should have expected **العجيب** or **العجيبة**. But it is hard to bring *wondering* into any connection with the root, and there is a possible connection for a *wonderful occurrence*.

According to Lane (p. 70, *a*) **الْمُؤْتَفِكَاتُ** and **الْمُؤْتَفِكَاتُ** occur in the *Qur'ān* of the cities overthrown by God upon the people of Lot. You can, then, say also **إِنتَفَكَتِ الْبَلَدَةُ**, *the land, or district, was, or*

became, overturned, or subverted, and **أَفَكَةٌ** or **آفَكَةٌ** means *a punishment sent by God whereby the dwellings of a people are overturned*. All these are evidently allusions to the story of the overthrow of the people of Lot and go back to the root-meaning of **أَفَكٌ** *to turn away, or back*. It

might then be possible to say **أَفَكٌ**, or its by-form **أَفْتُ**, of a wonderful occurrence, but only as an allusion to the passage in the *Qur'ān*.

Thus the possibility of **مُؤَفَّتٌ** going back to this **أَفْتُ** seems to be effectually blocked.

In order to give absolutely all the evidence, I shall now translate the corresponding article in the *Tāj al-'Arūs*, the commentary on the *Qāmūs* by Sayyid Murtaqā [d. A. H. 1205].

الأفت with *Fath* (the mention of *Fath* is unnecessary, our Shaykh [*i. e.* al-Firūzābādī] said it) is the she-camel with which is such patience and endurance as is not with other than her (Ibn al-A'rābī and Ibn Aḥmar said it); and (الافت) is the swift camel which overcomes the camels in journeying (from Tha'lab, and the feminine is the same, and he quoted from Ibn Aḥmar:—

﴿كَأَنِّي لَمْ أَقْلُ عَاجَ لَأَفْتٍ ﴿ تَرَاوَحَ بَعْدَ هَرَّتْهَا الرِّسْبَا ﴾﴾

and (الأفت) is the highly bred (Abū 'Amr said it and it was so in a MS. which was recited [or read] to Shamir, and the overtaker of other than it) of camels; (and the feminine is the same) and sometimes it has *Kasr*, (it stood so in a MS. of the *Tahdhīb* and he quoted from al-'Ajjāj.

﴿إِذَا بَنَاتُ الْأَرْحَبِيِّ الْإَفْتِ ﴾﴾

And (الأفت with *Fath* is) a calamity, and a wonderful occurrence, and an encampment of the tribe of Hudhayl; and (الافت) with *Kasr* is (a dialectal form for) الأفك,

and (they say) أَفْتُهُ عَنْهُ (like أَفْكُهُ whenever it) is, he turned him.

Here all is practically as in the *Lisān*, with the addition of what the *Qāmūs* has alone, and with everything arranged so as to form a running commentary on the *Qāmūs*. But it will be noticed that for what is in the *Qāmūs* alone the *Tāj* names no additional authorities, neither Ibn al-A'rābī, nor Abū 'Amr, nor any of the others are quoted in support of these usages. This is exactly what we should expect if أَفْتُ is a by-form to أَفْكُ in the sense of عَجِبَ and دَاهِيَةٌ, used, as we have found, in allusion to the Qur'ānic story of how God overturned the city of the people of Lot.

Since working this out, I notice that in the last edition of the German *Gesenius* (edited by Buhl) the existence of إَفْتُ in the required sense is said not to be *gut bezeugt*. We certainly might have better evidence for it, for example, if it were in the *Lisān*, but the real point is that it is post-Qur'ānic.